

---

The Making of the Roman People by Thomas Lloyd

Review by: Haven D. Brackett

Source: *The Journal of Race Development*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Apr., 1916), pp. 478-481

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29738177>

Accessed: 01-08-2014 01:20 UTC

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



<http://www.jstor.org>

mation of the Anti-Imperialist League, the campaign of 1900 in which expansion was the paramount issue, and the struggle by which Mr. Taft, at that time governor of the Islands, secured a legislative assembly for the Filipinos. He is especially bitter in regard to the publicity campaign which has been and is still being carried on by the retentionists. American public opinion has been very largely formed by officials and ex-officials of the Islands, who, according to Mr. Kalaw, must of necessity be prejudiced, and who have given glowing accounts of their own services but have minimized the assistance of the Filipinos and have insisted on their incapacity for self-government. President Wilson's policy, as developed by Governor-General Harrison, meets with Mr. Kalaw's hearty approval.

The last two chapters are devoted to a discussion of the Jones Philippine bill of 1914, which would have extended self-government within the Islands and would have a definite promise of future independence, and the Clarke Amendment of 1916 which would have granted independence within five years. The Jones Bill was acceptable to the Filipinos as a step in advance while the Clarke Amendment would have fully satisfied their desires. A spirit is growing up in the United States increasingly favorable to the independence of the Islands, due in part to an increasing interest in them but also to a realization of the economic unprofitableness and the military danger arising from their possession.

Mr. Kalaw has made a contribution in his analysis of American anti-expansion sentiment during the last eighteen years even though his reaction seems to differ little from that of a native-born American of anti-expansion tendencies.

*The Making of the Roman People.* By THOMAS LLOYD. London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1914. Pp. viii + 136.

From the brief introduction to the end this book is an extraordinary one. At the very beginning the author erects defenses against a possible unfavorable opinion of his work by expressing the opinion that only "the young, the fresh, the inquiring" will give his argument a fair hearing; most who "have attained a certain age" are thereby disqualified from judging him fairly.

The problem which the writer sets out to deal with is the determination of the racial element or elements which made up the "Roman people." His conclusion he summarizes on pages 60-64. In brief, he concludes that the historical "Roman people" arose

from an amalgamation of three elements, i.e., an original people belonging to the "Brown race" (i.e., the Aegean or Libyo-European race of the Mediterranean basin), a body of Gauls who under Brennus made their way from the valley of the Po down through the Italian peninsula and in 390 B.C. conquered Rome and the outlying parts of Latium, and certain Etruscan landowners and nobles who were in Latium at the time of the incursion of Gauls under Brennus. The Gaulish element became the patricians, the original Brown race the plebeians, of historical Rome. Thus at one bold stroke the author does away with the results of previous studies in this field.

It is safe to say that students familiar with the subject under discussion will, to adapt the author's expression (p. 77) consider this theory "a very sweeping deduction from exceedingly slender premises." In the opinion of the writer of this review the arguments of the author are wholly unconvincing. In the discussion of the prehistoric period of Mediterranean history his treatment of chronology, basing it as he does now on geology, now on archeology, is vague and obscure. Nowhere in the book does the writer give a single definite reference to an authority for any statement which he makes or to any other discussion of the complex problems which he attacks. The book is crowded with general conclusions drawn from wholly insufficient data, and with unsupported assertions. In some cases he fails to define certain terms which without clear and sharp definition are utterly meaningless. For example he asserts (p. 23) that "the Greeks are first met with in the far southeastern Mediterranean, in Cyprus, Crete and Rhodes;" but as to what he means by "Greeks"—whether the original Aegean race, or the invading Aryans, or the resultant from the amalgamation of these elements—he nowhere informs us.

Statements which are demonstrably erroneous are by no means infrequent. His account of the invasions of Greece at an early time by people of Aryan race (pp. 23 ff.) is largely at odds with the best modern opinion. His statement (p. 37) that "it is by no means improbable that the return of the Heraclidae really refers to an incursion of Gaulish clans" is wholly unsupported. If, as is generally supposed, the Heraclidae were a tribe speaking the Dorian dialect of the Greek language, they could hardly have been Gauls. His assertion (p. 42) that "the history of Rome previous to the invasion of King Pyrrhus, is a mass of contradictions and inconsistencies which raise all kinds of difficulties which cannot be satisfactorily disposed of," is of course preposterous. He

tells us (p. 50) that Schliemann discovered on the site of Troy three successive cities; the fact being, as any student of Greek history ought to know, that he discovered the remains of seven cities. On page 52 he implies that in 390 B.C. Rome was under Etruscan rule, and hence that the Roman republic had not then been founded. Although we read (p. 77): "Manifestly we cannot reject as much of those legends as do not suit our purpose, and accept as fact such as do," we find on page 52 a splendid example of precisely this procedure which he condemns.

But Mr. Lloyd's crowning achievement in the realm of bold and unfettered imagination, is found in chapters 4 and 5 (pp. 65-136) where he proceeds to demonstrate the "affinity of Latin and Gaelic." The reviewer commends this chapter to any worn and weary philologist who is looking for innocent amusement and relaxation. Two or three examples of the sort of entertainment here to be found must suffice. On page 84 Mr. Lloyd proceeds to point out affinities between Latin and Gaelic in the matter of idioms or "peculiar forms of expression which are entirely alien to other tongues." He quotes the Gaelic proverb "Life is precious, as the tailor said, *and* he running from the gander," and sets beside it Vergil's sentence "Timeo Danaos, *et* dona ferentes;" whereupon he proceeds, apparently gravely and seriously, to remark: if Vergil's expression is admitted to be a normal one "it is difficult to conceive any piece of evidence that would more clearly establish the Gaulish origin of the ruling class in Rome." On page 90 is given a list of the personal pronouns in Gaelic together with the corresponding Latin forms; among them, Gaelic "sinn" = Latin "nos," Gael. "sibh" = Lat. "vos." Then follows this comment: "it will be noticed that the plural forms of the personal pronouns in Gaelic and in Latin differ only because of the fact that the spelling is reversed in either the one language or the other. In Gaelic the first person plural *sinn* begins with *s* and ends with *n* whereas the first person plural in Latin begins with *n* and ends with *s*. Similarly, the second person plural in Gaelic begins with *s* and ends in *bh*, a combination which is pronounced exactly as *v* is in English. In the same way, the Latin corresponding word begins with *v* and ends with *s*." On page 94 he suggests that we may equate Greek *hui-os* (*viós*) with the O of O'Brien; and the Gaelic word for son (Mac) with the Latin *amic-us*. Such examples could be multiplied, but *ex pede Herculem*. And on page 78 the author remarks, apparently with perfect gravity, "If we are to arrive at the truth, we must reason scientifically."

In conclusion it may be added that the style of the book is frequently awkward, loose, slovenly and lumbering. That the book in its present form could have found its way into print is to the reviewer somewhat surprising.

HAVEN D. BRACKETT

*Professor of Greek, Clark College.*